



Memo

date: January 25, 2002

to: Distribution

from: Diana Votruba

subject: Minutes – SMD Self-Assessment – November 27, 2001

Meeting Agenda ([See Attachment](#))

Attendees ([See Attachment](#)) – Attendees are SMD unless otherwise noted

T. Kirk (High Energy & Nuclear Physics Directorate), M. Harrison, M. Anerella, B. Cox (ESD), L. Cuniff (ESD), J. D'Ambra, T. Dilgen, M. Gaffney (SHSD), G. Ganetis, H. Hocker, G. Jochen, P. Kovach, P. Lang (ESD), D. McChesney, T. Monohan (HP), R. Picinich, C. Porretto, D. Ports (ESH&Q Directorate), P. Ribaud, J. Schmalzle, T. Sheridan (DE), J. Sondericker, P. Wanderer, O. White (HP)

Meeting Purpose

The Superconducting Magnet Division's Annual Self-Assessment Review was held on November 27, 2001. The format of the meeting was a series of presentations given by Division members. Each presentation was structured as a review and critique of an individual element of the program as it is implemented within the Superconducting Magnet Division. This feedback of good points and areas for improvement is an integral part of the continuous improvement cycle.

Topics Discussed

- Division Update & Self Assessment Goals
- A Directorate Perspective on Program Goals
- Formal ES&H FY01
- Work Control Critique
- Training & Development FY01 Review
- Process Management Review
 - Design Process Critique
 - Parts Procurement Critique
 - Computing Environment
- Close-Out

Presentations and Discussions

(Comments by Presenters are bulleted. Participants' comments are italicized)

- **Division Update & Self Assessment Goals – Mike Harrison**

- [Division Update & Self-Assessment Presentation](#)

- Self-Assessment Process: We need to focus on the feedback phase of the improvement cycle.
 - Dropped Magnet: certainly a "not normal" activity; we reviewed what happened and why.

- The Magnet Division design review process critique was well done.*

- BNL Lab Wide Personnel Audit: we will continue to ponder the issue of training and development for new skills.

- **A Directorate Perspective on Program Goals – Tom Sheridan**

- The Superconducting Magnet Division does a great self-assessment, with focus on feedback and improvement. Impressed that we perform a good critique.

- SHS Division used a similar critique process as part of their self-assessment, based on SMD success.*

- The Self Assessment Subject Area was re-evaluated based on complaints, and will be changed soon. Considerations include increased flexibility, the number of required assessments, and guidance to departments and divisions.

- Self-assessment is difficult; you have to take a hard look at yourself, look for root causes, and institute meaningful corrective actions.

- In 2002, impact of self-assessment in BSA will be greater.

- **Formal ES&H FY01 – Mike Gaffney**

- [Formal ES&H Presentation](#)

- EMS Management Review being performed as part of self-assessment.
 - Environmental Management Program Targets:

- Six out of how many corrective actions were identified? Thirty.*

- Primary Helium Refrigerator incident: Heat exchanger leak caused oil to enter BNL Sanitary System.

First Incidence – Peconic River; Suffolk County became involved. Pro-active approach was appreciated when Sue had to go to the public to respond.

- PCB Lighting Ballast Failure:
Will all PCB ballasts be replaced this year? Steve Waski gave T. Dilgen a commitment that all will be cleared out in two years.
- Floor Drains: *Floor drains should be looked at, they could become a problem.*
- Wet Vac: The Division should consider purchasing wet vacs, even if the laboratory does not.
- Record of Decision

Is the EMS Program effective in achieving environmental policy commitments (P2C4)?

Yes, we are quite effective in doing certain things. Lack of money is a factor; it makes it become a balancing act. We could do a better job in some areas. Process good.

Is the EMS Program effective in achieving environmental objectives and performance measures?

Yes. Is it possible to establish a control level for waste minimization? Yes, we need to talk to Hazardous Waste Management people to find a level that has value, not just pick a number.

Is the EMS Program adequate to identify and manage significant environmental aspects, and to identify resource allocations?

Yes. We need to develop an operating budget for things not covered by lab-level maintenance.

Are objectives and performance measures suitable to actual environmental impacts, stakeholder concerns, current and future regulatory requirements, and SMD interests?

Yes.

- Chemical Management: Supervisors should take better control of where everything is; the system is web-based.

➤ Magnetic Fields:

Is there a way to map out the areas? Yes. We need to cordon off areas where devices are. Some areas are complex so a meter may not let you know that a device is present.. We need a happy medium. We need to close out this item.

➤ Rigging Incident:

What was final categorization of the finding? It was labeled a near miss. We do not know the final dollar amount of damage.

• **Work Controls Critique – Henry Hocker**

[Work Controls Critique Presentation](#)

Findings from Audit

- Findings from audit reveal that worker knowledge and perception of the system is good.
- Work permits are being written in a collaborative effort; feedback is considered.
- Cryogenics area does not have a primary reviewer assigned or a work control logbook.

Is this finding being worked on? Yes, Henry is working with K.C. Wu and Ron Picinich on this.

- Service provider signatures are not being executed on some work permits.

Are the lack of service provider signatures internal or external, i.e., Plant Engineering? It is Plant Engineering; this is a recurring problem.

Are work permits issued where appropriate? Yes. Is the ratio of work permits - to-logbook entries okay? Yes. Do the work permits show evidence of good judgement? Yes.

Was the assessment guide from ESH Standard 1.3.6 used? Yes. Was it useful? Yes.

Do people follow the work permits? Yes, for the most part.

- **Training and Development – Chris Porretto**

- [Training and Development Presentation](#)

- The Division maintained its 95% training completion percentage.
 - The required annual update of JTAs and employee-to-JTA links was performed.
 - Action items from FY00 self-assessment were completed except for impulse training course.

- Who is working on impulse training course? John Escallier.*

- Employee Survey: availability of professional development training is an issue with Magnet Division employees.

- The reasons why Magnet Division personnel do not get more involved in training are not understood. Since the survey was taken in August or September, people may have been concerned about layoffs. They may have been wondering what the value of training might be.*

- Section Heads agree that HR training schedule notices can be sent to all SMD supervisors.*

- The technicians could use more computer training, perhaps in-house courses taught by David McChesney.*

- For FY02, need to establish instructor qualification for internally-delivered training.

- For Hipot and Impulse training who qualifies the instructor? Mike Harrison and George Ganetis qualify instructors based on education, technical expertise, and experience. There is an instructor qualification form that must be completed and signed.*

- **Process Management Review - Design Process Critique – Paul Kovach**

- [Design Process Critique Presentation](#)

- The existing design process features a close, informal working relationship among engineers, designers, and technicians. This has advantages and disadvantages.
 - Learning curve on new CAD software has resulted in brief loss of productivity for some designers.

- Where is the group on the learning curve for the new software? Everyone is now using the new software, though some have been using it longer than others have.*

- A "Design Team" approach among engineers, designers, and technicians is recommended.

Is the current system of design reviews no good? We could benefit from a close-knit working group. Right now it's done on an informal basis. This sounds like a good idea.

- **Process Management Review - Parts Procurement** – Jesse Schmalzle

- [Parts Procurement Presentation](#)

- The web requisition system is convenient but not user friendly.

This problem is lab-wide. We don't have the ability to change it. Would like to see some improvements.

- The approval time for requisitions is excessive. We should consider reducing the number of required approval, and routing the requisition for approval in a parallel.

Maybe the number of approvals can be cut down.

- The information feedback on requisition status and particulars is poor. Requisitioner does not get copy of PO.

Does everyone have access to Peoplesoft? Not aware how the whole system works and what reports are available. The system is not user friendly.

- Purchasing does not track open orders and receiving lacks necessary PO info.

Do requisitioners get monthly updates? No. The system needs to be looked at more closely. The problem needs to be addressed.

- **Process Management Review - Computer Environment** – David McChesney

- [Computer Environment Presentation](#)

- Computer Hardware: We are replacing 5 to 10 computers a year. This is not a sufficient rate.

We have 86 computers with 486s or less? Yes. We need to replace them faster, but there is a money issue.

- Network Security: In the future, all computers must be registered before being used. This will prevent people coming in from the outside and plugging in their PCs.

How will people be able to work then? We are unsure, it will be a problem.

- Computer Security is a burden, it takes approximately 1/3 to 1/2 of David's time.

Does the Magnet Division get reimbursed for ITD security burdens? No.

- The SMD website needs work. The website needs to be moved to an ITD web machine.
- We need to do training to increase users understanding of domains. This should be a lab-level training course. In general, we need more user training to increase the knowledge base. ITD should provide this training.

John McNeil teaches computer courses at a local college; perhaps he could teach some courses.

- **Close Out - Mike Harrison**

- [Close-out Presentation](#)

- Upper management's approach is very sensible.
 - ESH
 - We need to work on spills; they are a persistent problem.
 - No budget exists for environmental items.
 - We need to do something about SMF auditing of complex.
 - People must FOLLOW PROCEDURES!
 - Work Controls
 - Talk was positive; overall program is working.
 - Collective judgement in assessing risks is good.
 - Training
 - Program goals have been achieved.
 - 90% of training is in safety and access area; we may need to look at this.
 - We need to look at computer skills for technicians.
 - Process Management
 - Concept of design team is good, and will be discussed.
 - Jesse Schmalzle gave an important presentation that needs to go to a higher level of management at BNL.
 - We need to increase computer replacement rate.
 - We need to update the Magnet Division web page.

Distribution: Attendees
J. Usher